

Serial No. 10/625,842  
Amdt. dated January 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

- 5 -

**REMARKS**

Applicant has cancelled claims 3-4 and 19-23.

Applicant has amended claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Kofford, Munk or Mee. It is asserted that claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by any of the cited references.

Claim 1 includes a delivery channel of substantially uniform diameter and having a tapered inlet and an outlet having the same diameter as that of the delivery channel. Kofford and Munk do not disclose a channel outlet having the same diameter as the channel itself. The valve member 19 of Kofford has an opening 22 which flares out, as shown in Figures 2 and 3. There is no disclosure that the opening 22 has a uniform diameter.

Munk shows an orifice that flares out, shown in Figure 7. There is no disclosure that the orifice is of the same diameter as the passageway 62.

Mee does not disclose a cylindrical delivery channel having the same diameter as the orifice opening 20. Mee does not disclose a cylindrical passageway; instead, it shows a conical passage 23 that leads directly to the orifice 20, as shown in Figure 8.

In view of the above, it is asserted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited references.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 13 as being unpatentable over Kofford, Munk or Mee in view of Watanabe.

Serial No. 10/625,842  
Amdt. dated January 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

- 6 -

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no disclosure in Kofford, Munk or Mee that the respective pin is secured by adhesive. In Kofford, the clip 23 is rotatable to accomplish precise adjustment. In Munk, a set screw 66 secures an end of the stand-off 67 in a recess 70. In Mee, the post 17 in one end is inserted in a blindhole and held firmly in position by deforming the material around it. Watanabe is not directed to the art of airless atomizing nozzle. Accordingly, it is asserted that there is no teaching or suggestion to make the combination as proposed by the Examiner.

In view of the above, since none of the references, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest applicant's claimed invention, it is asserted that claims 1-2 and 5-18 are patentable over the cited references and are asserted to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested and an early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.


Concurrently submitted herewith is a Petition To Revive the above-identified application for unintentional abandonment.

Serial No. 10/625,842  
Amdt. dated January 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

- 7 -

It is believed that no fee is due; however, should that be incorrect, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-2105 and inform the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Josefino P. de Leon  
Reg. No. 33,166

SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP  
1420 King Street, Suite 600  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-5600  
lm